



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,301	05/30/2001	Prabuddha Biswas	A-017	8102

21253 7590 05/07/2004
CHARLES G. CALL
68 HORSE POND ROAD
WEST YARMOUTH, MA 02673-2516

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2177

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/870,301

Applicant(s)

BISWAS ET AL.

Examiner

Miranda Le

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 11-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 and 11-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 03/04/2004.
2. Claims 1-5, 11-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11 are independent claims. In the Amendment A, no claims have been added, claims 6-10, 16-20 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 2, 11, 12 have been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejection of claims 8-10 by 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
4. The objection to the specification (drawings, claim objection) of the invention has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-2, 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Weisshaar et al. (US Patent No. 6,580,916 B1).

Weisshaar anticipated independent claims 1, 11, by the following:

As to claims 1, 11, Weisshaar teaches “apparatus for performing location-dependent data processing operations comprising, in combination, a relational database management system for creating and updating data structures comprising a first set of one or more relational tables describing objects, said data structures including means for storing data specifying the geographic location of at least selected ones of said objects” at col. 10, lines 9-49, col. 23, line 39 to col. 24, line 53,

“means for storing reference data in a second set of one or more relational tables describing a plurality of system defined regions, said reference data including the specification of the geographic location of each given one of said system defined regions and a human interpretable description of each given one of said regions” at col. 10, lines 9-49, col. 23, line 39 to col. 24, line 53,

“a user-manipulated control comprising: means for visually displaying to a user said human interpretable description for said system defined regions” at col. 16, lines 40-61, col. 18, lines 3-64,

“means for accepting from said user an identification of a plurality of system defined regions” at col. 16, lines 40-61, col. 18, lines 3-64, col. 27, line 54 to col. 28, line 67,

“means for generating the specification of a new user defined region consisting of the combination of said plurality of system defined regions” at col. 16, lines 40-61, col. 18, lines 3-64,

“means for storing reference data describing said new user defined region in said second set of tables” at col. 16, lines 40-61, col. 18, lines 3-64, col. 27, line 54 to col. 28, line 67,

Art Unit: 2177

“means responsive to said control for transferring selected items of said reference data to said means for storing geographic location data associated with one of said objects” at col. 20, lines 19-48, col. 29, line 8 to col. 30, line 28.

As to claims 2, 12, Weisshaar teaches “user-manipulated control further comprises means for identifying a selected one of said regions described in said second set of tables and for transferring data specifying the geographic location of said selected one of said regions to said first set of tables to specify the geographic location of a specified one of said objects” at col. 29, line 8 to col. 30, line 28.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 3-5, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisshaar et al. (US Patent No. 6,580,916 B1), in view of Hancock et al. (US Patent No. 6,202,023 B1).

As to claims 3, 13, Weisshaar does not teach “said means for storing reference data includes means for storing said reference data in a hierarchy of regions”. However, Hancock teaches this limitation at col. 31, line 65 to col. 32, line 51, col. 12, line 11 to col. 13, line 4, col. 31, line 65 to col. 32, line 51, Fig. 20.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Weisshaar with the teachings of Hancock to include “said means for storing reference data includes means for storing said reference data in a hierarchy of regions” in order to provide a user-friendly, truly local addressing system that provides users with information that is specific to the user’s geographic location.

As to claims 4, 14, Hancock teaches “said hierarchy of regions consists of a parent-child hierarchy of levels holding regions of decreasing size characterized by each child region having a geographical extent the lies within the geographical extent of its parent region” at col. 12, line 11 to col. 13, line 4.

As to claims 5, 15, Hancock teaches “said reference data defines the boundaries of each of said regions and wherein any first region having defined boundaries within the boundaries of a region is nested within said second region within said hierarchy” at col. 6, line 65 to col. 7, line 22, Fig. 1.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments regarding the cited Hancock et al. patent does not describe user-manipulatable control that allows the user to specify user defined regions with respect to the amended claims 1-5, 11-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203.

Art Unit: 2177

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Miranda Le
May 3, 2004



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER